

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS***Brief Summary of Status***

Claims 1-58 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-28 and 50-58 are allowed.

Claims 39 and 41-44 are rejected.

Claims 40 and 45-49 are objected to.

Claim Objections

In the above-referenced office action, the Examiner asserts the following:

“1. Claims 1 and 27 are objected to because of the following informalities:”
(office action, Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20090217, p. 2)

The Applicant has amended certain of the claims.

As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these objections.

35 U.S.C. § 103

In the above-referenced office action, the Examiner asserts the following:

“3. Claims 39 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen (US 2003/0227914) in view of admitted prior art.” (office action, Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20090217, p. 2)

The Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Applicant has amended certain of the claims.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claim 39 is allowable over these Examiner-cited references.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that Nguyen, and the Examiner-characterized “admitted prior art”, when considered individually or together, fails to teach and disclose the subject matter as claimed by the Applicant in these claims.

In view of at least these comments made above, the Applicant respectfully believes that independent claim 39 rejected above is patentable over these cited references.

The Applicant respectfully believes that this dependent claim 44 rejected above, being a further limitation of the subject matter as claimed in an allowable independent claim, respectively, is also allowable.

As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of these claims.

In the above-referenced office action, the Examiner asserts the following:

“4. Claim 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen and admitted prior art, and further in view of McCorkle (U.S. Pat No. 7,346,120).” (office action, Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20090217, p. 4)

The Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Applicant respectfully believes that the inclusion of McCorkle fails to overcome the deficiencies of Nguyen, and the Examiner-characterized “admitted prior art”.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that Nguyen, the Examiner-characterized “admitted prior art”, and McCorkle, when considered individually or together, fails to teach and disclose the subject matter as claimed by the Applicant in this claim.

In view of at least these comments made above, the Applicant respectfully believes that independent claim 39 is patentable over these cited references.

The Applicant respectfully believes that this dependent claim rejected above, being a further limitation of the subject matter as claimed in an allowable independent claim, respectively, is also allowable.

As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of this claim.

In the above-referenced office action, the Examiner asserts the following:

“5. Claim 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen and admitted prior art, and further in view of Bajikar (US 2002/0198001).” (office action, Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20090217, p. 5)

The Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Applicant respectfully believes that the inclusion of Bajikar fails to overcome the deficiencies of Nguyen, and the Examiner-characterized “admitted prior art”.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that Nguyen, the Examiner-characterized “admitted prior art”, and Bajikar, when considered individually or together, fails to teach and disclose the subject matter as claimed by the Applicant in this claim.

In view of at least these comments made above, the Applicant respectfully believes that independent claim 39 is patentable over these cited references.

The Applicant respectfully believes that this dependent claim rejected above, being a further limitation of the subject matter as claimed in an allowable independent claim, respectively, is also allowable.

As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of this claim.

In the above-referenced office action, the Examiner asserts the following:

“6. Claim 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen and admitted prior art, and further in view of Ojard (U.S. Pat No. 7,362,817).” (office action, Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20090217, p. 5)

The Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Applicant respectfully believes that the inclusion of Ojard fails to overcome the deficiencies of Nguyen, and the Examiner-characterized “admitted prior art”.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that Nguyen, the Examiner-characterized “admitted prior art”, and Ojard, when considered individually or together, fails to teach and disclose the subject matter as claimed by the Applicant in this claim.

In view of at least these comments made above, the Applicant respectfully believes that independent claim 39 is patentable over these cited references.

The Applicant respectfully believes that this dependent claim rejected above, being a further limitation of the subject matter as claimed in an allowable independent claim, respectively, is also allowable.

As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of this claim.

Allowable Subject Matter

In the above-referenced office action, the Examiner asserts the following:

“7. Claims 1-38 and 50-58 are allowed.

8. Claims 40 and 45-49 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.” (office action, Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20090217, p. 6)

The Applicant respectfully agrees with the ex, in that, claims 1-38 and 50-58 are allowed.

With respect to the objection of claims 40 and 45-49, the Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Applicant respectfully believes that independent claim 39 is allowable.

The Applicant respectfully believes that these dependent claims objected to above, being further limitations of the subject matter as claimed in allowable independent claims, are also allowable.

As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to these claims.

The Applicant respectfully believes that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that they be passed to allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile if the Examiner believes that such a communication would advance the prosecution of the present U.S. utility patent application.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,
By: /SXShort/ Reg. No. 45,105
Shayne X. Short, Ph.D., Reg. No. 45,105
Direct Phone: (512) 825-1145
Direct Fax No. (888) 456-7824

GARLICK HARRISON & MARKISON
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
P.O. Box 160727
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78716-0727
TELEPHONE (512) 825-1145 / FACSIMILE (888) 456-7824 or (888) 711-8305